

Planning Committee

Update Sheet

21st July 2016

The information set out in this Update Sheet includes details relating to public speaking and any change in circumstances and/or additional information received after the agenda was published.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
1	15/01383/OUT	Land at Vale Farm, Romsey Road, Pitt, Hampshire	Refused

Agenda Page: 3

Officer Presenting: Jill Lee

Public Speaking

Objector: David Barnes

Parish Council representative: Joe Winchester

Ward Councillor: Cllr Eleanor Bell, Cllr Brian Laming

Supporter: Mike Newton (applicant) James Bevis

UPDATE 1.

Update: letter containing the applicant's response to the HCC highways objections and other matters in the report.

Land at Vale Farm, Romsey Road, Pitt (15/01383/OUT)

In advance of the above application being determined at planning committee on 21st July, I write to highlight a number of points raised in the Committee report which we either consider factually inaccurate or points which we wish to highlight to members prior to Committee. I would be grateful if you would inform members of the points raised in this letter.

Landscaping

The Committee report states that there will be a minimum 8.2ha of open space. With the change in access to provide a signalised access to the site, the minimum amount of open space has increased to 8.35ha. This is more than double the amount of public open space required by policy (3.5ha).

Concerns are raised in the report over the green 'buffer' between the development and Pitt. This green buffer is significant in size and would prevent coalescence of the development and Pitt. Furthermore, Linden Homes wrote to the residents of Pitt in February 2016 suggesting that they gift this open area to the residents of Pitt and establish a management company to manage and maintain this part of the site. With this buffer gifted to the residents of Pitt, it ensures and guarantees that there would be no further development on this portion of the site and thus permanently protects the separation between the development and Pitt.

Southern Water

Unfortunately not all of the response from Southern Water has been copied into the committee report. While Southern Water notes that currently there is inadequate capacity in the local network to provide foul sewage disposal to service the development, their comments continue on to provide wording for an informative and a condition which overcome the points raised. It should be made clear that Southern Water have not objected to the development.

Informative 3 - Plans and Documents

The Travel Plan (dated 27 May 2016) has been missed off this list of plans and documents to be considered with this application. The Travel Plan has been agreed with Hampshire County Council and also satisfies the Environmental Health team at Winchester City Council with regards to air quality.

Design

The consultation response from the Urban Design officer suggests that views of the development from Sarum Road have not been taken into account. However, the proposal has been carefully considered. The site levels on Sarum Road are circa 147.00 and the proposed houses are around 125.00 contour, thus some 20m+ lower. The Illustrative Layout and the Density Plan clearly identify lower density development along this northern edge and the Building Heights Plan clearly identifies this edge as being 'up to 2 storey' with a maximum height of 8.5m. With a typical roof height, this would give a significant difference in level ensuring that views from Sarum Road and indeed some way south towards the site are retained.

The Urban Design officer also criticises the proposed layout of the local centre and assumes that the spatial layout has been influenced by Winchester City Centre. This assumption is not correct. The Design and Access Statement clearly sets out that due to unsuccessful mixed use centres in the wider area and based on the settlement size proposed, the Square was deemed the most appropriate design and its characteristics have informed the space. Details of the Square would be determined through reserved matters and would demonstrate an attractive and useable space.

Highways and Transport

We have already submitted a letter to yourself and Hampshire County Council on 6th July which sets out our position with regards to the consultation response from Hampshire County Council. This letter is appended. There are a number of factual inaccuracies in the response from HCC and it is disappointing that they are still listed in the Committee report despite us highlighting them prior to the publication of the Committee report. The factual inaccuracies are as follows:

- The comment about the junction being on the boundary of a 40/50 mph speed limit is incorrect. While this is what is shown on google street view (dated 2011) the speed limit along this stretch of the road was amended to be 40mph a couple of years ago;
- HCC claim that speeds are 'likely to be towards 50mph'. We have previously provided HCC with recorded speeds, which showed 85th percentile speeds of 40mph/42mph, not the assumed 50mph.
- HCC claim that no modelling work has been provided so they cannot comment on junction performance or capacity. Modelling work was issued to HCC back in November 2015 when they first requested it.

There are also a number of other aspects which we strongly disagree with, namely the concerns over the signalised access, especially given that HCC agreed to the principal of the signalised access in discussions in January 2016. In particular, we refute the comments by HCC that there is no demand for a pedestrian crossing and refute the claim that the development does not comply with paragraph 32 of the NPPF. Further information on these arguments can be found in the appended letter which was submitted to the Council on 6 July 2016.

I would be grateful if you would pass this letter onto members prior to Committee in order that the contents of this letter can be taken into account during the Committee meeting.

Yours sincerely

Mandy Owen
Principal Planner

[WCC response to the above letter;](#)

UPDATE 2.

Additional consultation from HCC education not included in the committee report.

Education Justification for S106 Contributions

for

Land At Vale Farm, Romsey Road, Pitt, Hampshire

27 November 2015

Please note: These are indicative figures, in order to establish at an early stage, an approximate level of financial contributions. As more detailed

work is undertaken on specific proposals the County Council will provide a site specific estimate of costs and the financial contributions may rise or fall depending on local on-site factors and the extent and timing of infrastructure and alterations that may be required.

Statement on the requirement for developer's contribution towards

Education

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions and revoked many of the Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance, which were formerly material considerations. NPPF para 6 states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219 of the NPPF, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

NPPF para 72 states that The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Moreover, local planning authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools. NPPF para 176 states that where safeguards are necessary to make a particular development acceptable in planning terms (such as environmental mitigation or compensation), the development should not be approved if the measures required cannot be secured through appropriate conditions or agreements.

NPPF para 203 states that local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.

NPPF para 204 states that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the three tests; a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The requirement to mitigate pressure on schools in an area

The *Education Act 1996* S14 places a duty on Local Authorities to secure that schools are sufficient in number, character and equipment to provide for all pupils the opportunity of appropriate education. Therefore, there needs to be sufficient appropriate places to accommodate pupils. The meaning of *sufficient in number* is salient as there is a need for more places to be available than the projected number of children who would take up those places.

The Audit Commission recommends that schools should not operate at full capacity. The 1996 report *Trading Places: The Supply & Allocation of School Places* notes in paragraph 9 that value for money in the supply of school places is served by avoiding both too many and too few places and that LAs need to secure a close fit between pupils and places at a wider level and with regards to

individual schools. It further recommends that LAs plan for a 95 per cent occupancy rate at schools, with a variation of plus or minus 10 per cent, around this target.

Furthermore, the 2002 report *Trading Places – A Review of Progress on the Supply and Allocation of School Places*, recommends in paragraph 9 that it is unrealistic and probably undesirable to aim for a perfect match of pupils and places at each school. Some margin of capacity is necessary to allow parents choice, given that there will be volatility in preferences from one year to the next. It further notes that not all unfilled places are 'surplus'. Therefore, a reasonable figure is for there to be 5% spare places in any school and these places should not be considered surplus places.

An additional factor not considered by the Audit Commission is the need to plan for the provision of places for children who move into an area after places have been allocated, or at other times during the year. Therefore there needs to be some 'headroom' in the provision of places to allow for such late applicants.

The total capacity of a school relates to the total number of pupils that may be admitted into a school. This number can be compared to the total number of pupils in a school – the Number on Roll (NOR). The Department for Education (DfE) use this methodology to calculate surplus places. This is a suitable measure for circumstances when a school population is relatively stable and gives a useful long-term measure of capacity. This method does not, however account for trends in numbers, where, for example, higher year groups may have fewer children than lower year groups, but the surplus places measure indicates the average number of surplus places across a school.

Mitigating the impact of the proposed development

There is much evidence within the legislative framework relating to the planning system that development should not be permitted regardless of its impact on communities. The effects of development should be mitigated in order to make otherwise unacceptable development acceptable. If the effects of a development cannot be mitigated, then that development would be unacceptable and should not be permitted. S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 makes provision for Local Planning authorities to require planning conditions or planning obligations (referred to as "S106 agreements") to make otherwise unacceptable development acceptable. Thus a S106 agreement may prescribe the nature of a development; secure compensation for loss or damage created by a development; or mitigate a development's impact. S106 education contributions are usually for the mitigation of the effects of a development.

A Core planning principle in NPPF para 17 is that planning should take account of and support local strategies to improve cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community facilities and services to meet local needs. Therefore, it would be appropriate to require a planning obligation to address an existing deficiency in education infrastructure where the additional children yielded by a development would exacerbate that deficiency.

Hampshire County Council Pupil Forecasting Methodology (Published)

Assessment of four year olds living within the catchment area:

Immunisation and vaccination data from local health authorities is collected by age and postcode and is then allocated to enumeration districts. This information is updated annually and takes account of demographic and other trends, including those for the pre-statutory age group i.e. data are collected for year 0 onwards. The number of 4 year olds by enumeration district is then aggregated to school catchment areas. Where an enumeration district straddles a school catchment area, the number of 4 year olds is proportioned to the relevant schools by the number of address points in each catchment area. Future intakes are estimated by calculating an average participation rate (PR) based on rates observed over the previous three years, using a three year moving average (weighted 3:2:1), giving the greatest weight to the most recent year. This weighted participation rate is applied to future forecast numbers of 4 year olds to determine likely intake to Year R. Schools with participation rates over 100% attract pupils from outside their catchment area. Schools with participation rates below 100% lose pupils to neighbouring schools, other authorities or the independent sector.

Forecast numbers for other year groups:

Primary:

This methodology used for year groups 1-6 is based upon a cohort survival model. The basic premise is that pupils will roll forward from year group to the next at the end of each academic year. If there are known housing developments within a schools catchment area, the expected pupil yield is added to the projections at the rate of 0.3 for primary and 0.21 for secondary. This information is provided by the County Environment Department and substantiated by district councils. Expected changes due to pupil mobility and migration are also taken into account. For each year group, the number of pupils on roll in January is compared with the same cohort a year later. A weighted moving average of the observed changed over the last three years (3:2:1) is calculated and applied in the same way as the participation rate

Secondary:

At secondary transfer, the PR is applied to the numbers available in the linked primary schools, with similar adjustments made to take account of housing and year-on-year trends. Projections are reviewed annually on the basis of the January census. Pupils dual-registered between a school and education centre are included only on the school number on roll. 54 pupils are registered on the education centre roll and it is assumed for forecasting purposes that this number will remain constant.

Pupil numbers

This development lies across two catchment areas. A small part of the proposed development is within Stanmore Primary School catchment, and the majority is within John Keble CE Primary School catchment. However Oliver's Battery Primary School and St Peter's C Primary School are geographically closer to the proposed development.

It is the case that the provision of school places in these areas of Winchester City Council are under significant pressure.

Calculating the number of pupil places required

Section 4 of the County Council's Developers' Contribution Policy contains details on how many places are required as a result of new housing. In order to assess the long term demand arising from a new housing development, the County Council uses the following factors:

Primary Schools (ages 4 to 11) – a minimum of 0.30 children per dwelling
Secondary Schools (ages 11-16) – 0.21 children per dwelling

These factors apply to all dwellings with two or more bedrooms and are based on pupil yield data from recent housing developments.

The County Council's Developers Contributions Guidance can be found at

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/education/school/school-places>

The Developers' Contributions Guidance has been endorsed by the County Council and is reviewed and updated on an annual basis.

Requirement for primary school places

The pupil forecast information detailed above highlight the pressure for primary school places in the area. A project to expand one of the local Primary Schools by 105 places is proposed, an estimated cost of £1,664,250. It is anticipated that these projects would be completed in line with the timing of the need from the proposed development. These expansions are necessary to meet demand for primary school places arising from housing development recently completed and new housing sites planned within the school catchment areas. This development will contribute to the demand for additional places and a contribution as detailed below is therefore required to mitigate the impact on primary school places.

Level of contribution required

The planned housing development at Pitt Vale consists of 350 dwellings of unknown size. A contribution in line with HCC's Developers' Contributions Guidance is given below to indicate the likely level of contribution.

Primary

Yield = $0.3 \times 350 = 105$

$105 \times \text{£}15,850 = \text{£}1,664,250$ primary contribution required.

Overall total education contributions required = £1,664,250

IMPORTANT: Please note these costs are indicated, at 4th Quarter 2014 prices (BCIS All-in TPI Index 255) and at 17 November 2015.

These are indicative figures, in order to establish at an early stage, an approximate level of financial contributions. As more detailed work is undertaken on specific proposals the County Council will provide a site specific estimate of costs and the financial contributions may rise or fall depending on local on-site factors and the extent and timing of infrastructure and alterations that may be required.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Compliance

This above named and costed project/infrastructure meets the requirements of April 2010 Regulation 122(2) CIL by being:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Conclusion

In order to mitigate the impact of this development on school places in the area, a fair and reasonable contribution towards the provision of education infrastructure must be paid.

If a developer were to impede HCC in the performance of any of its functions, then the proposed development should be considered unacceptable. A development should only be considered acceptable if the developer were to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.

UPDATE 3.

An additional reason for refusal will be needed to cover the current lack of S106 agreement to cover off site contributions towards education;

The proposed development is contrary to policy CP21 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy in that it fails to make provision for the needs of education generated by the development and would therefore adversely impact on the provision of education in the locality.

UPDATE 4. HCC HIGHWAYS RESPONSE TO THE AGENTS LETTER ABOVE.

This is in response to the highway matters raised within the letter dated 20th July 2016 from Boyer and appended letter from I-Transport dated 6th July 2016.

It is noted that some inaccuracies were made within our response dated 24th June 2016 in that the comments made on the junction in relation to the boundary of the

40/50mph speed limit had not taken into account that this boundary had indeed been relocated. Additionally, this would have an effect on the comment in relation to 'speeds are 'likely to be towards 50mph'. We accept the inaccuracy as identified and are happy that this aspect of our comments is corrected.

However, having re-consulted internally on this matter our overall concerns on the form of junction remain valid, namely that HCC have safety concerns with the junction as presented – notably with the eastbound approach as detailed within our response dated 24th June 2016 as follows:

Currently traffic regularly queues past this point throughout the AM peak headed into Winchester. Observations show that traffic headed towards Badger Farm Road overtakes this queue and free flows towards the roundabout in the offside lane at speed. This presents a pedestrian safety hazard and should be avoided. This is particularly applicable to pedestrians walking towards the school in the AM peak who will be masked by those vehicles queuing in the nearside lane and who may be tempted to try to cross before their stage appears.

The traffic modelling provided to HCC was provided informally in November 2015 but was never submitted formally to WCC. Our formal response dated 24th June 2016 can only address information that has been submitted formally through the local planning authority and as such is not referenced within our response. It is noted that due to the inherent safety concern identified the traffic modelling may need to be amended to take account of this. Further to this the applicant has not provided a Road Safety Audit to accompany the junction design.

With regard to the signalised access not being suitable, HCC have always maintained that the applicant would need to demonstrate that the most suitable form of access is being presented. This was stated within our original response dated 16th September 2015.

During previous discussions, HCC had asked the developer to provide 'options testing' to demonstrate that the most appropriate location and form for the junction is being taken forward. Additionally, HCC asked whether a fourth arm added to the existing Pitt roundabout would be a feasible access strategy.

The TA does not provide any 'options testing' and as such it has not been demonstrated that the most appropriate location and form for the access junction is being taken forward

This was further stated in our response dated 24th June 2016.

It is considered the applicant has not adequately demonstrated that traffic signals are the appropriate access solution or are being proposed for the right reasons. Further work to explore other options would need to be provided to demonstrate that the most appropriate form of junction is provided. .

A signalised access is a potential option, as stated at the meeting in January

2016. The context here is that the most suitable form of access has not been demonstrated. Further to this, all that has been presented to HCC to date has been a roundabout design and the signalised design referenced above. For the roundabout design HCC stated that they could look at providing a roundabout design further to the west where the topography would be more suitable. For the proposed signalised design HCC have stated that there is an inherent safety issue that has not been addressed.

I trust the above is clear but please do not hesitate to contact me on the above number should you wish to discuss anything further. I would reiterate that the comments and recommendations raised in both my previous responses to this application still represent the views of the highway authority, save for the minor correction as set out in this response.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
2	16/00218/FUL	Cunningham House, Claylands Road, Bishops Waltham, Hampshire	Permitted

Agenda Page: 53

Officer Presenting: Stephen Cornwell

Public Speaking

Objector: Elizabeth Hiscock

Parish Council representative:

Ward Councillor:

Supporter:

Update

The agent acting for the applicant has sent in two late letters of representation. One is a copy of the letter dated 2 February 2016 and which accompanied the application when first submitted. The main points of this letter have already been reported in the proposals section in the report.. The following are the main points from the second letter dated 19 July 2016.

- Existing building two storey with flat roof.
- Proposal will add traditional hipped roof on top of building and form five flats in space created.
- Note application recommended for approval.
- Number of issues raised by local residents and wish to respond.
- Main concern of residents relates to car parking and survey submitted with application.
- Proposal provides five on site parking spaces for the proposed flats. These spaces not used in association with existing occupation of the building.
- Building currently occupied by 20 self contained flats where not all residents have access to a private car. Those that do either park in remaining available spaces on site or on the street.
- In response to initial query over parking situation applicant commissioned on street parking survey undertaken by Highway Engineer. This standard

technique for evaluating such an issue.

- Survey identified 13-14 available on street space within 100m of site.
- Note resident's question time survey undertaken. Both surveys occurred at 2000 hours and 2100 hours.
- Survey shows adequate capacity on street and no parking stress within locality.
- Proposal also carefully designed to ensure no harmful impact on adjoining residents by loss of privacy, loss of light or overbearing impact.
- Request that members support recommendation and grant planning permission.

Planning Officers Response

Late letter is in support of officer's recommendation.

Proposed conditions have been shared with applicant and he is comfortable with them.

No change to recommendation.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
3	16/00772/FUL	Brooklands House, 1637-1638 Parkway, Whiteley, Hampshire	Permitted

Agenda Page: 63

Officer Presenting: Russell Stock

Public Speaking

Objector: Paul Crowley

Parish Council representative:

Ward Councillor: Cllr Achwal

Supporter: Jackie Barnet (Applicant)

Update

Whiteley Town Council

The Town Council has seen the proposed conditions for Brooklands to mitigate noise issues as far as is practical and is happy to withdraw its objections. The Town Council wishes to encourage children to play outside at every opportunity.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
4	16/00686/FUL	Land East of Main Road Otterbourne. Hampshire	Permitted

Agenda Page: 69

Officer Presenting: Stephen Cornwell

Public Speaking

Objector: Alan Clark

Parish Council representative: Cllr Mary Acton

Ward Councillor:

Supporter:

Update

The following comments have been received in response to the revised plan and further information.

Tree Officer:

The submission at this stage of a full arboriculture impact and method statement is not imperative and can be covered by a pre start commencement condition if planning permission is granted.

Environmental Health Officer:

I have no objection to the revised proposals and welcome a planning condition regarding storage and disposal of manure as detailed. I suggest it would be sensible to maximise the separation distance by placing storage area on far side of stables.

Otterbourne Parish Council:

- Still strongly object to application even though plans been revised to address some of the many local concerns.
- Application contrary to saved policy RT11 and concerns over traffic entering and leaving site.
- (Copy of revised comments attached below)

Seven representations have been received from 5 households

- Revisions do not address previous objections which remain valid.
- Seek assurance all fences repaired or replaced as needed.
- Question if site notice displayed at site.
- Details relating to manure storage do not address concerns about odour especially as stable block moved closer to dwellings.
- Situation worse as stable block now closer to homes than before.
- Access is a track shared by 4 dwellings, question where visitors will park and concerned track will be obstructed.
- Use of track will also result in noise disturbing residents.
- Will owner be prevented from renting out space to other horse owners
- Applicant says they will only keep 3 horses on land but what is to stop them increasing number afterwards.

- Applicant says no immediate plans to bring items onto land but what is to stop them from doing this in future.
- Ask Highway officer to re-consider his comments.
- Proposal at odds with Village Design Statement and view that open views should be protected.
- Development jeopardises use of footpath across land by walkers.
- Ask committee to consider all concerns raised and refuse application.

Planning Officers Response

The comments from the Tree Officer had been anticipated and have already been incorporated into the main report and recommendation.

It has been noted that condition 9 (Landscape Management Plan) should include a reference to the implementation of the approved fencing scheme. This will be corrected below.

It has also been noted that the requirement to fence off the perimeter of the fields means that the applicant will have to install in excess of 1.5km of fencing. This has the potential to be an expensive operation. Accordingly, the condition has also been adjusted to allow for the site to be brought into use as paddocks on a phased basis, requiring only those area that are to be grazed to be fenced off.

The proposed conditions have been discussed with the agent who thinks they are agreeable in principle but will advise if his client has any concerns.

The advice from the EHO that the manure storage heap is placed on the side of the stable furthest from the residential properties requires an adjustment to condition 6. This will be corrected below.

Regarding the general comments from the Parish Council and the local residents these have not raised any new issues that have not already been considered and addressed in the main report.

Revised condition 6 Storage and Disposal of Manure

In accordance with the details as set out under point 4 of the letter from Carter Jonas dated 3 June 2016, all horse manure/stable waste shall be stored on the hardstanding on the eastern side of the stable block and not on the bare ground or be allowed to spill over onto the bare ground. In accordance with the above details all the manure/stable waste shall be disposed of offsite when the storage area is full and shall not be spread across any of the land or attempts made to burn it on the site.

Reason

To ensure that the amenities of nearby residential properties are not adversely impacted by the development proposed.

Revised condition 9 Landscape Management Plan

Before any horses are first brought onto the land, a landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This plan shall cover the following aspects:

1. The measures to be put in place to protect the boundary hedgerows and hedgerow trees from being damaged by any horses. This detail will include the type of fencing to be used, its height and the offset distance that the fencing will be constructed away from the hedgerow.
2. The measures to be put in place to protect the trees within the triangular area that lies to the north of Charlotte Meade and identified in green on the plan attached to this decision notice. The detail shall take its lead from the content of point 3 of the Carter Jonas letter dated 3 June 2016. The detail will include the type of fencing, its height and the offset distance that the fence will be constructed away from the trees.
3. A plan for the planting up with hedgerow and tree species of any gaps in the hedgerows including details of the local indigenous species to be planted, the planting layout, size on planting and the measures to protect the plants.
4. A scheme for the future management of the hedgerow and trees within the site including any future planting.
5. A timescale for the proposed planting scheme.

In the event that the applicant does not propose to allow horses to “free graze” on all of the application site from the date of the implementation of this consent, then the details submitted as part of the Landscape Management Plan shall include a plan showing the subdivision of the land identifying those area(s) to be “free grazed” and those areas not to be grazed. Horses shall only be grazed on those section identified for this use and only the perimeter hedgerows and trees to that land needs to be protected from damage in accordance with the fencing scheme as detailed elsewhere in this condition.

Before any further land is free grazed its boundary hedgerow and trees shall be protected in accordance with the fencing specification referred to above.

For the avoidance of doubt “free grazing” is meant to refer to letting a horse run free within a fenced off area of ground.

The approved fencing scheme shall be implemented before any horses are brought onto the land and maintained hereafter so that no damage to the boundary hedgerows and trees occurs so long as the land and stables are in equine use.

Any planting and maintenance work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.

If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree, that tree or any tree planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree of the same local indigenous species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason

To protection the visual amenity and landscape character of the site.

.....
The Revised Otterbourne Parish Council Comment in full.

Otterbourne Parish Council (OPC) still strongly objects to this Planning Application even through the plans have been revised to take into consider some of the many local objections.

The application is in contradiction to the saved policy RT11, there are concerns about traffic entering and leaving the site.

Policy RT11

RT 11 is a saved policy under the Local Plan Part 1.

This policy states for the development of stables where possible existing buildings will be used and should not involve the erection of new buildings which may harm the landscape appearance of the area.

OPC considers the landscape will be impacted and even though the stable block has been relocated on the revised plans OPC is still concerned ramblers and dog walkers will be affected by horses grassing in this area. Unless the public footpath is fenced off from the paddock, mixing pedestrians, many with dogs, with horses or ponies in the same space is a potential safety hazard.

Access

Access to the proposed stable block is still from Main Road Otterbourne even though the stable block is nearer the road, the properties on this access track will be adversely affected by the regular riders visiting the stable, transport of waste products and possible horse boxes entering the field. Leaving the track onto the Main Road still has very restricted view for drivers.

OPC is concerned there have been two similar applications for the development of equestrian facilities in the same area within the village and their possible cumulative impact.

The first application had been rejected by Winchester City Council but was granted on appeal, if this revised application is approved OPC would request that similar restrictions are imposed, namely:

1. the facility should only be for private or family use;
2. further permitted development rights relating to the construction of other structures on the site are removed in the interests of the character and appearance of the area;
3. conditions relating to materials, external lighting, landscape details, landscape implementation and tree protection should be applied as appropriate in the interests of character and appearance;
4. a condition relating to the storage and removal of waste is also required to minimise the local impact of this development.

OPC would also ask that if the Case Officer is minded to approve the application, the matter is heard at a Planning Committee and would wish to address the Committee on this matter

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
5	16/00940/FUL	Well Cottage, Mincingfield Lane, Durley, Southampton, Hampshire, SO32 2BR	Permitted
Agenda Page: 85			
Officer Presenting: Richard Palmer			
<u>Public Speaking</u>			
Objector: Stephen McGee, Jane Pardoe, Lucien Warwick-Haller			
Parish Council representative:			
Ward Councillor:			
Supporter:			
<u>Update</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional site plan and block plan showing the full size of the neighbours (Anona) rear garden has been received. • Amended drawing (500/47A) showing the change from a Juliet balcony to a window on rear elevation. An additional planning condition will be added in relation to this minor amendment to the fenestration. • A series of photos from Anona have been received. 			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
6	SDNP/15/05317/FUL	Land between Alton Road & Marlands Lane, West Meon, Hampshire	Refused
Agenda Page: 95			
Officer Presenting: Jane Rarok			
<u>Public Speaking</u>			
Objector:			
Parish Council representative:			
Ward Councillor:			
Supporter: Mike Fowler, Norma Bodtger, Roderick Davidson			
<u>Update</u>			
<u>Archaeology comments:</u>			
<p>Development to the north of the application site (Storey's Meadow) led to the discovery of a significant archaeological site in 2011. This comprised a Bronze Age barrow which subsequently formed the focus of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery. The cemetery certainly extended to the north of the Storey's Meadow site, and this area is now designated as a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>No cemetery (or other) remains were identified during the preliminary evaluation trenching within the southern and western parts of the Storey's Meadow site, or within the extreme south of the subsequent excavation area. It is possible that archaeological remains possibly associated with the Bronze Age barrow and Anglo-Saxon cemetery may be present within the application site. Consequently, as the</p>			

proposed development involves extensive groundworks across the application site it will adversely affect any surviving archaeological remains that may be present within the site.

If consent is granted and in accordance with Section 12 of NPPF, an archaeological evaluation comprising trial trenching and any further mitigation works required subsequent to this should be undertaken. This can be secured via appropriately worded archaeological conditions.

End of updates